

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-35 and 37-53 are pending in this application. Claims 34-35 and 37-47 are rejected. Claims 1-33 and 48-53 are allowed. Claim 36 was previously cancelled. Claims 44-47 are amended. No new matter has been added. In view of the following remarks, Applicants request allowance of the Application.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative in the telephonic interview conducted on October 15, 2010, and provide this Statement of the Substance of the Interview in compliance with MPEP § 713.04.

During the interview, the Examiner and the undersigned discussed the § 101 rejections with respect to claims 40-43. The Examiner agreed that she would withdraw the rejections.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 101

Claims 44-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. Applicants have amended claims 44-47 to read: "...non-transitory computer-readable medium..." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 103

Claims 34, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagihara, US Pat. No. 5,374,958, in view of Sugiyama, US Pat. No. 6,940,922 and further in view of Honda et al., (hereinafter "Honda"), US Pub. No. 2002/0009139. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagihara, Sugiyama and Honda and further in view of Alattar et al., (hereinafter "Alattar"), US Pat. No. 7,567,721. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hui, US Pat. No. 6,654,417 in view of Sugiyama and Honda and further in view of Tsuru, US Pat. No. 6,950,040.

Claims 34-35 and 37-39 define over the prior art

Independent claim 34 recites in part:

wherein the video coding chain deletes motion vectors under control of the rate controller.

The combination of Yanagihara, Sugiyama, and Honda does not teach or suggest at least the above-highlighted element of the video coding system recited in independent claim 34. In particular, the combination does not teach wherein the video coding chain deletes motion vectors under control of the rate controller. As disclosing this element, the Examiner cites Honda, specifically paras. 175 and 179, and figure 9. Applicants respectfully disagree. Honda does not mention the phrase "motion vectors," much less does it teach that a video coding chain deletes motion vectors under control of the rate controller.

For at least these reasons, Applicants believe that the rejections of claim 34 and its associated dependent claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All outstanding rejections have been overcome. It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the foregoing remarks, the application is in clear condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Although not believed necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

The Office is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Date: October 20, 2010

/Justin Blanton/

Justin Blanton

(Registration No. 58,741)

Customer No.: **62132**

Kenyon & Kenyon LLP
333 West San Carlos Street, Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500

Facsimile: (408) 975-7501